

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Sandhu et al. (US 2003/0033212 A1).

Summary of Amendment

Claims 1-22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. These claims were withdrawn from consideration due to a restriction requirement mailed on May 3, 2007. Applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications directed to these cancelled claims.

Claims 23-25 have been cancelled. New claims 26-55 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 26-55 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Comply with §103

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Sandhu et al. (US 2003/0033212 A1). Claims 23-25 have been cancelled. New claims 26-55 have been added. Support for these claims are found throughout the specification as originally filed such as, for example, in FIG. 1 and pages 6, 9-12, 16, and 17 of the specification as

originally filed. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

To the extent applicable, Applicants respectfully submit that Sandhu et al. fails to teach or suggest new claims 26-55. More specifically, Sandhu et al. is directed to the “front-end” of a trading system. That is to say, Sandhu et al. is directed to a system that facilitates trading/negotiations. By contrast, the present invention is directed to a “middle” and “back-end” system that processes already executed trades or consummated deals. In other words, the present invention begins where the system of Sandhu et al. ends.

For example, independent claims 26, 36, and 46 recite, in part, “remotely located client devices to capture information concerning one or more deals from one or more users...wherein the one or more deals are *executed trades* and the one or more users are *the party or the counterparty to the one or more deals*.” (Emphasis added.) By contrast, the “transactions” disclosed in Sandhu et al. are not “executed trades,” but rather transactions that will occur in the future. For example, Sandhu et al. discloses that “the Member must decide on the type of transaction it wishes to execute... and structure the desired transaction.” (See Sandhu: para. [0205].) In other words, the deal discussed in Sandhu et al. is not an “executed trade” and the member is not “a party or counterparty to the one or more deals” since the transaction in Sandhu et al. has not yet been executed.

As another example, independent claims 26, 36, and 46 recite, in part, “the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals.” Sandhu et al. fails to teach or suggest capturing information concerning a “product type” and then routing the captured information based on the

product type.

Because the Sandhu et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the features discussed above and because Sandhu et al. is directed to a different system and method than the claimed invention for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that at least independent claims 26, 36, and 46 are not obvious over Sandhu et al.

Dependent claims 27-35, 37-45, and 47-55 depend from one of independent claims 26, 36, and 46, thereby incorporating all the features of their base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 27-35, 37-45, and 47-55 are also allowable for at least the reasons explained above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

#

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
Kyle J. Choi
Reg. No. 41,480

Dated: October 16, 2007

Customer No.: 009626
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001